BACONIANA.

VOL. II. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1904. No. 5.

JUDGE WEBB.

IN the October Number of the *National Review* a brilliant article on "The Genuine Text of Shakespeare" appeared from the pen of Judge Webb. No one of the many readers whom it must have delighted and instructed, would have supposed that it was the last specimen we were to have of his bright, incisive, and delicately sarcastic style. Nor, if it had been unsigned, would anyone suspect that its author, instead of being in the hey-day of his literary prowess, had already passed his eightieth year. This article reads like a chapter from his admirable work on "The Mystery of William Shakespeare," which, too, has all the sparkle of youth combined with the "health and graveness" of maturity, although the author was a very old man when it was written. One who knew him well, says, "In spirit he had no old age, and was as vigorous and keen on his death-bed as any man of forty." Baconians the world over will mourn the passing away of so accomplished and redoubtable a champion of the genuine authorship of Shakepeare.

Judge Webb was born on May 5th, 1821, in Cornwall, where his father was a Nonconformist clergyman.

He gained a classical scholarship in Trinity College, Dublin, in 1845, and carried off all prizes for English essays and poems. He became Professor of Moral Philosophy (Mental Science), in 1858, and in 1863 he became a Fellow, defeating in an extremely close contest, Dr. Mahaffy. In 1867 he was appointed Regius Professor of Law, which position he resigned in 1871. In 1879 he was made Public Orator to the Dublin University. His Latin speeches, introducing the recipients of degrees conferred *honoris causa*, were invariably characterized by that *curiosa felicitas*, which his English style would lead us to expect in so finished a scholar. His philosophical works on *The Intellectualism of Locke* and *The Veil of Isis* (this latter treats of all forms of Idealism) have been pronounced to be "not only brilliant but profound." There is an appendix on Bacon's philosophy in *The Veil of Isis* well worth studying. It is of the *multum-in-parvo* kind. One of the most distinguished critics of the day says of his metrical translation of *Faust*:—"His *Faust* is often very brilliant, and though he knew every word of *Faust*, he didn't know German—at least not much outside Faust."

One would have thought that for such a man the life of all others to be preferred would be that of a scholar, a thinker, and a writer, but he himself thought otherwise. He resigned his Fellowship to practise at the bar, to which he had been called in 1861. He made quite a reputation for himself as an orator and a cross-examiner. At the trial of the Phœnix Park murderers, where it is said, "he had the worst case that ever a barrister had to handle," none of the celebrated counsel engaged "displayed such resource, such power in cross-examination, and such readiness in speech."

He was, it is almost unnecessary to say, large-minded in his views. He was in favour of granting to the Irish

Catholics a University, such as they could conscientiously frequent. He had been a Gladstonian till Home Rule made him a Unionist. But for this change his final position would in all probability have been higher than a County Court Judgeship, which he was appointed to in 1888, and which he resigned but a few months ago.

During the long period that Judge Webb was so prominent a figure in Dublin society, he ranked with the first as a wit, aud a brilliant conversationalist. Some who write brilliantly and wittily are very disappointing to meet and talk with, but Judge Webb was as interesting and amusing, as suggestive and stimulating in his conversation as in his writings. He deserves great credit for braving by open avowal of Baconianism the wrath or the ridicule of the "orthodox" Shakespeareans.

During his life he enjoyed for the most part remarkably good health, and was remarkable, too, for invariably good spirits. He married in 1849 Miss Susan Gilbert, who survives him. Two sons, one a barrister, and a married daughter, Mrs. O'Dell, mourn his loss. Their grief is shared by all who had the privilege of Judge Webb's acquaintance. He died after an illness of some months (which, however, was not pronounced mortal till about a month before the end), on Nov. 10th, 1903, retaining to the last the keenness of mind and equanimity which had always distinguished him.

S.

THE "EPISTLE DEDICATORIE" OF THE FIRST FOLIO.

SOME time ago Mr. Wigston asserted that the plays of "William Shakespeare" were saturated to an extraordinary degree with classical learning; and quite recently (*Fortnightly Review*, April, May, July, 1903) in a series of papers entitled "Had Shakespeare read the Greek Tragedies?" Mr. J. Churton Collins furnished—even to the layman—abundant proof that such is the case.

The "Epistle Dedicatorie" of the First Folio purports to have been written by two of Shakspere's "fellow-actors"—John Heminge and Henrie Condell. The accuracy of these men's statement has frequently been impugned. It is not very surprising, therefore, to find that the source of a considerable part of their "Epistle Dedicatorie" is the Preface to Pliny's Natural History. That Messrs. Heminge and Condell were accomplished Latinists has not, we believe, been hitherto claimed for them. An English translation of Pliny was published in 1601, but it will be observed that the "Epistle Dedicatorie" agrees generally much better with the modern translation in "Bohn's Library Edition" than with the earlier, and at that time—so far as we know—the only accessible English translation of Philemon Holland (London, 1601). The author of the "Epistle Dedicatorie"—whoever that may have been—apparently drew upon the original text, and that with considerable skill.

Shakespeare Folio, 1623.
"Epistle Dedicatorie."

TO THE MOST NOBLE
AND
INCOMPARABLE PAIRE
OF BRETHREN.
WILLIAM,

Parallel passages from *The Natural History of Pliny*. Translated by John Bostock, M.D., F.R.S., and H. F. Riley, B.A. . . . Henry G. Bohn, London, MDCCCLV. (1855). Vol. I.

Earle of Pembroke, &c., Lord Chamberlaine to the *Kings most Excellent Maiesty.*

AND

PHILIP,

Earle of Montgomery, &c. Gentleman of his Maiesties Bed-Chamber. Both Knights of the most Noble Order of the Garter, and our singular good Lords. Right Honourable,

1. Whilst we studie to be thankful in our particular, for the many fauors we haue receiued from your L.L. we are falne vpon the ill fortune, to mingle two the most diuerse things that can bee,
2. feare, and rashnesse; rashnesse in the enterprize, and
3. feare of the successe. For, when we valew the places your H.H. sustaine, we cannot but know their dignity greater, then to descend to the reading of these trifles:
4. and vvhile we name them trifles, we haue depriu'd our selues of the defence of our
5. Dedication. But since your L.L haue beene pleas'd to thinke these trifles something, heeretofore; and haue prosequuted both them, and their authour liuing, with so much fauour: we hope, that (they out-liuing him, and he not hauing the fate, common with some, to be exequutor to his owne writings) you will vse the like indulgence toward them, you haue done vnto their parent. There
6. is a great difference, vvhether any Booke choose his Pat-

2. "But my temerity [rashness] will appear the greater by the consideration, that these volumes, which I dedicate to you, are of such inferior importance [trifles]" (p. 4).
3. "I considered your situation much too elevated for you to descend to such an office." (p. 3).
4. "And by this dedication I have deprived myself of the benefit of challenge" (p. 3).
5. "For still thou ne'er wouldst quite despise the trifles that I write" (p. 1).
Lamb's transl. of Catullus Carm. i., 4.
6. "For it is a very different thing whether a person has a

rones, or finde them: This hath done both.

For, so much were your L.L. likings of the seuerall parts, vvhen they were acted, as before they vvere published, the Volume ask'd to be yours. We haue but collected them, and done an office to the dead, to procure his Orphanes, Guardians; vvithout ambition either of selfe-profit, or fame: onely to keepe the memory of so worthy a Friend, & Fellow aliue, as was our SHAKESPEARE, by humble offer of his playes, to your most noble
7. patronage. Wherein, as we haue iustly obserued, no man to come neere your L.L. but vvith a kind of religious addresse; it hath bin the height of our care, vvho are the Presenters, to make the present worthy of your H.H. by the perfection. But, there we must also craue our abilities to be considerd, my Lords. We cannot go beyond our owne powers.
8. Country hands reach foorth milke, creame, fruites, or what they haue: and many Nations (we haue heard) that had not gummes & incense obtained their requests with a leauened Cake. It vvas no fault to approch their Gods, by what meanes they could.

9. And the most, though meanest, of things are made more precious, when they are dedicated to Temples. In that name therefore, we most humbly consecrate to your H. H. these remaines of your seruant SHAKESPEARE; that what delight is in them, may be euer your L.L. the reputa-

judge given him by lot, or whether he voluntarily selects one" (p. 3).

7. . . . "even those who come to pay their respects to you do it with a kind of veneration: on this account I ought to be careful that what is dedicated to you should be worthy of you" (p. 4).

8. "But the country people, and, indeed, some whole nations offer milk to the Gods, and those who cannot procure frankincense substitute in its place salted cakes, for the Gods are not dissatisfied when they are worshipped by every one to the best of his ability" (p. 4).

9. . . . "for things are often conceived to be of great value, solely because they are consecrated in temples (p. 6).

tion his, and the faults ours, if any be committed, by a payre so carefull to shew their gratitude both to the liuing, and the dead, as is

Your Lordshippes most bounden,

IOHN HEMINGE.
HENRY CONDELL.

The following are the corresponding passages from "The Historie of the World—commonly called the naturall historie of C. Plinius Secundus. Trans. into English by Philemon Holland, &c." (London, 1601, folio), and text passages from *C. Plinii Secundi Naturalis Historia :* D. Detlefsen rec. Berolini apud Weidmannos, MDCCCLXVI. (1866).

1. "That vvhiles vve studie and muse (as *Varro* saith) upon these things . . ." (second page after Sig. G 2).

1. . . . vel hoc solo praemio contenti quod, dum ista (ut ait M. Varro) *musinamur,* pluribus horis vivimus (Praef. 18).

2. "For mine own part, challenged I may be more still for this my importune and inconsiderate boldnesse, in that I would seeme to present these bookes uuto you, compiled of so slender stuffe and matter as they be" (p. Sig. G 2).

2. Meae quidem temeritati accessit hoc quoque, quod levioris operae hos tibi dedicavi libellos (Praef. 12).

3. "I wish full well that you were a greater person far, and I supposed that you would never abase yourselfe nor stoupe so low as to read this book of mine" (p. Sig. G, verso).

3. Maiorem te sciebam, quam ut descensurum huc putarem (Praef. 6).

4. "But cut I am from this refuge and meanes of defence, in that I expressely make choise of you in this dedication of my worke" (G 2).

4. Sed haec ego mihi nunc patrocinia ademi nuncupatione (Praef. 8).

5. . . . "*You were wont to have some good opinion of my toies and fooleries*" (p. Sig. G).

5. *Namque tu solebas nugas esse aliquid meas putare* (Praef. 1).

6. . . . "for one thing it is to have a judge either pricked by pluralitie of voices or cast upon a man by drawing lots; and a farre other thing to chuse and nominate him from all others" (G 2).

6. . . . quoniam plurimum refert sortiatur aliquis iudicem an eligat (Praef. 8).

7. . . . "No marvell is it, if those that doe their dutie unto you, salute you, kisse your hand, and come with great respect and reverenee: in which regard, exceeding care above all things would be had, that whatsoever is said or dedicated unto you, may beseem your person, and be worth acceptation.

7. Te quidem in excelsissimo generis humani fastigio positum, summa eloquentia, summa eruditione praeditum, religiose adiri etiam a salutantibus scio, et ideo cura, ut quae tibi dicantur tui digna sint (Praef. 11).

8. "And yet the gods reject not the humble prayers of poore countrey peasants, yea, and of manie nations, who offer nothing but milke unto them; and such as have no Incense, find grace and favour many times with the oblation of a plaine cake made onely of meale and salt; and never was any man blamed yet for his devotion to the gods, so he offered according to his abilitie, were the things never so simple" (G 2).

8. Verum dis lacte rustici multaeque gentis, et mola tantum salsa litant qui non habent tura, nec ulli fuit vitio deos colere quoquo modo posset (Praef. 11).

9. . . . "for many things there be that seeme right deare and be holden for pretious, only because they are consecrate to some sacred temples (second page after G 2).

9. multa valde pretiosa ideo videntur quia sunt templis dicata (Praef. 19).

G. P.

XVIth CENTURY GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

OWING to the paucity of available facts, Shakspere has had to be educated hypothetically to suit the situation.

Born in 1564, in the scattered and squalid village of Stratford-on-Avon, licensed to marry in 1582, and having children born as late as 1584, we must assume the first 21 years of his life to have been spent in and around Stratford.

Our first enquiry should be, "Did he ever go to school?" In those days, and certainly in that district, boys did not become schoolboys as a matter of course.

Thirteen of the village Council of nineteen were unable to sign their names. From Ascham's "Schoolmaster," published 1571, we learn that a father did not send a child to school unless it had aptitude.

Sending a child to school in those days was as much a matter of consideration as sending a boy to the Army or Church is in these.

A dull child, says Ascham, never lacketh beating. Perusal of this little book, gives one a better understanding of the

> "Whining schoolboy with his satchel,
> Creeping like snail
> Unwillingly to school."

Supporting the assumption that Shakspere actually went to school are three facts:—

1st.—He became an actor of small parts. Although oral methods of teaching were used in those days, it is not improbable he learnt to read sufficiently to memorise his parts himself.

2nd.—From five signatures (posterity's only inheritance) we may infer that he could write his name indifferently.

3rd.—The better opinion is that he also wrote the words "By me."

If he went to school we may safely assume it was in Stratford. In 1578 his father could not raise fourpence for rates, and presumably was unable to pay for his son being boarded and educated in a neighbouring town—Coventry for instance.

In 1535 and onwards, Stratford possessed a School. A Grammar School say some. What were these Grammar Schools, and how did this one develop?

Says the 1868 Schools Commission Report: "Choirs in training to sing the Latin offices appear to have been the nucleus of many of the early Grammar Schools; and when the Chantries and Monasteries were dissolved at the Reformation, the Schoolmaster was restored with the Latin grammar in his hand."

According to Dugdale, the Guild of the Holy Cross at Stratford, had, in the year 1535, four priests and a clerk, who was also schoolmaster at £10 per annum. A later survey showed that their possessions, in addition to tithes, comprised a five-roomed priests' house, a garden and dovehouse, and that one of the priests conducted services at a central chapel, and was teacher of the grammar school at the side of it.

All this was very necessary. The choristers had to be trained to read and sing in Latin.

In 1540 the Guild was dissolved with the other English Monasteries.

In 1553 Stratford obtained a re-grant of the forfeited tithes conditional on the town (which was incorporated for the purpose) maintaining a vicar, curate, and schoolmaster, paying some almspeople, and keeping the chapel, the bridge, and the school in repair.

When Shakspere was nine years old, the small schoolroom was still preserved and had a schoolmaster.

What books were available to the scholars? The

Wills and Inventories of the time and district do not disclose the existence of any books as private property.

The Stationers' Register for the period shews indeed a singularly poor supply for the whole of England. What books then may be expected to have belonged to the school under the personal charge of the master?

Lilly's Latin Grammar must have been there, and none other, so as to comply with the Queen's Ordinances of 1559 and 1571.

Ocland's Latin Panegyric of Elizabeth, written in 1580, was also enjoined to be read as a classic in every Grammar School. For dictionary (Latin-English) they had probably Cooper's "Thesaurus" 1552; other likely equipments would be the "Abceedarium" of 1552, the Psalter, the English Catechism, the A. B. C., some inkhorns, quills, paper, tallow candles and the schoolmaster's rod.

This hardly seems enough educational material wherewith to acquire at Stratford the classical knowledge of Latin shewn in the plays and verses attributed to Shakespere, whilst of education in English there was apparently none.

Mr. Churton Collins ("Fortnightly," April, 1903) has brilliantly demonstrated that the writer of the Plays "Could almost certainly read Latin with as much facility as a cultivated Englishman of our own time reads French; that with some, at least, of the principal Latin classics he was intimately acquainted; that through the Latin language he had access to the Greek classics, and that of the Greek classics in the Latin versions he had in all probability a remarkably extensive knowledge."

A *Daily News* Reviewer plaintively warned Mr. Collins that he was giving the Shaksperian case away. Mr. Collins, however, seems to have felt that he could still hypothetically educate his man in Latin at any rate.

Mr. Spencer Baynes had once essayed the task and succeeded in bringing settled convictions to Mrs. Stopes; but his notions do not satisfy Mr. Collins, nor should they pass muster with anyone.

Mr. Baynes vouched the book of one Hoole, published in 1659, of what happened thirty or so years before at Rotherham's first School, of which he was Head Master. At this School one master taught writing, another music, and a third grammar. The statement as to what Latin authors were read in a Grammar School about seventy years after the time when Shakspere could have gone to school, is of no pertinent value. But when Hoole goes on to refer to the "*traditional plan* of forcing a child to learn by heart a crude mass of abstractions and technicalities it cannot comprehend, of compelling it to repeat in dull mechanical routine definitions and rules of which it understands neither the meaning nor the application," we may safely assume that matters at least were no better in 1573 than in 1630.

After a reference to the book of one Brinsley, who can tell us very little, Mr. Spencer Baynes next vouched the curriculum prescribed in 1583 by its founder for the Grammar School of St. Bees, in Cumberland. Grindall, Archbishop of Canterbury, was born there, and devoted his last years to founding and endowing this school. He was an eminent scholar, and naturally very particular about the curriculum of the project of his old age, but as the Patent and transfers to the School Governors were not confirmed until 1605, it is doubtful whether the school was in working order until that date.

The Archbishop's Ordinances are set out in Carlisle's "Endowed Grammar Schools." Mr. Baynes argued that the curriculum so carefully prescribed for St. Bees is a fair guide as to the curricula of other grammar

schools of the period, and many years earlier. An obvious comment is, "*Why, then, was it specifically and in detail prescribed ?*"

That the founder was so particular as to the course of reading at a school his own money was to endow, is an indication that existing systems did not meet with his approval. Nor have we any proof that the full course was ever followed, because in the ordinances the schoolmaster is allowed his choice of the prescribed books, "to take or leave as he thinketh meet, save that the Accidence, the Queen's Grammar and the Catechism shall not be omitted."

Clearly this *minimum curriculum* was contemplated by the founder as possibly all that might be practicable.

Mr. Churton Collins very properly rejects Mr. Baynes as an unsafe guide upon the subject of Stratford education in 1573.

I hope to shew that Mr. Collins himself is equally in the clouds. He takes as representative of an average grammar school course in 1573, the curriculum formulated by no less a person than Cardinal Wolsey, in 1528, for a projected school at Ipswich.

"Wolsey," writes Mr. Chalmers, "was a liberal patron of literature, of consummate taste in works of art, elegant in his plans and boundless in his expenses to execute them."

About 1519 he contemplated an elaborate and expensive scheme of Lectureships, in Oxford, but three only were realised, namely, for Greek, Latin, and for Rhetoric at Corpus Christi Hall.

His schemes of buildings were grandly conceived and executed with care and deliberation.

To build Hampton Court Palace occupied Wolsey from 1514 to 1528—a period of fourteen years.

For Wolsey's projected Cardinal College, Oxford, the revenues of twenty-two suppressed religious orders,

totalling to £2,000 per annum of money in those days, were appropriated.

The foundation laying was a big public ceremonial on 20th March, 1525. One year's capital outlay on building was nearly £8,000. When Wolsey died in 1530, only the kitchen, the hall, and about three sides of the quadrangle of this magnificent building were finished.

A College of 160 persons had been formed to occupy it, but there were no scholars. These were to be supplied from Wolsey's native town of Ipswich. Let us follow the working of his scheme there.

At Ipswich his plan comprised a College, constituted of a Dean, twelve Canons, eight Clerks, and eight Choristers. This College was to have a grammar school attached.

He obtained an old Priory site of six acres in March, 1527, and requested the French Court to open a new quarry at Caen, to supply him with good stone. For endowment he obtained transfer of part of the possessions of ten Monasteries.

In 1528 he drew up in Latin the rules of his College and School. They are to be found set out in a book called "Essay on a System of Classical Instruction." (London: John Taylor, 1825.)

Wolsey evidently intended a large number of classes working on a finely graduated system. Interest was to be excited in the district by publication of the proposed rules. The Corporation had to be won over to the scheme, as some of their lands were required. It is, as it were, this grandiloquent prospectus of a company which did not go to allotment which has saved Mr. Collins to the orthodox notion of the authorship of the plays.

From this hypothetical grammar school those most soundly prepared scholars were intended to be passed

on to the College in Oxford, taught by the best men of the day, a College which, according to Wolsey's promises was to be the repository of copies of all the manuscripts of the Vatican. The curriculum was the best Wolsey could devise.

Was it ever taught? *I think not.* In Wodderspoon's "Historic Sites of Suffolk," there are some useful facts. The foundation stone of the college and school was not laid until 15th June, 1528, and the Corporation granted their land in the same year.

Mr. Wodderspoon sets out an interesting letter to Wolsey, from the newly-appointed Dean, dated 27th September (probably of 1529). It speaks of the delivery of 171 tons of stone from Caen, and that more was expected. The College part appears to have been just set going, but whether in a temporary building or not, is not shewn.* He speaks of a procession to Church of himself, the sub-dean, six priests, eight clerks, and nine choristers, "with all our servants." He refers to the difficulty of the sub-dean "upon his charge of surveying of the works and buildings of your Grace's College."

He also refers to a Mr. Senthall, who "is always present at Mattins, and all masses with Evensong," and who "is very sober and discrete, and bringeth up your choristers very well, assuring your Grace there shall be no better children in no place of England than we shall have here, and that in a short time." There is no evidence that anything more than the gatehouse was ever built. Wolsey's disgrace and death were in 1530.

According to Dugdale's "Monasteries," the site of the College was granted to someone else in 1532, two years after Wolsey's collapse.

* The Priory was taken over with the site; so the Priory building may have been used for the College for the time being.

Upon the evidence I venture to assert that *Wolsey's curriculum was never put into practice,* even at Ipswich.

But why go to an Archbishop's school in the North-west, or to a Cardinal's school in the East of England for relevant inferences about the sort of education available at Stratford-on-Avon?

What evidence is to be gathered from neighbouring towns in Warwickshire. Mrs. Stopes tells us that on Speed's old map of Warwickshire, Stratford is shown half as large as Coventry.

Let us refer to Coventry. There, in 1546, one Hales maintained a school in the choir of the Church. In 1573 his Executors conveyed to the Corporation revenues to maintain a City Free School, paying £20 per annum to a Master, £10 to an Usher, and £2 12s. to a Music Master.

According to Ordinances, as late as 1628, charcoal only is to be burnt in the school; the scholars are not to have free run of the library; the Dictionaries are to be chained in the schools, and the Masters are made responsible for all books from the Corporation library.

St. Paul's School, London, was founded by Dean Colet, in 1510. Its curriculum, formulated in June, 1518, shows nothing in common with Wolsey's. "First the Catechism in English, next the Latin Accidence, then Erasmus and other Christian authors."

Search the particulars of other schools of the period, and no evidence of uniformity of scholars' courses can be found.

Shakspere's hypothetical education at Stratford, according to a curriculum prescribed for, but doubtless never practised at Ipswich, will therefore not stand cross-examination.

But both Wolsey's and Grindall's courses are useful indications of what a good tutor at the University would be likely to teach. and the higher grade literature

which a well placed student, such as the writer of the Plays, according to Mr. Collins, evidently had access to.

Private tuition for the sons of the aristocracy, was the main care in those days. Ascham's "Schoolmaster" clearly shews this. Francis Bacon, we know, was sufficiently well tutored by the age of twelve as to be sent to Trinity Hall, Cambridge, under Whitgift, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. He was there from April, 1572, to December, 1575. Thence until September 1576, at the English Court. Then two years and a half at the Courts of France, and probably of Italy. From March, 1579, he was in England, and in 1580, resident at Gray's Inn.

If the cipher story be true, he was the Immerito of the Gabriel Harvey Immerito Correspondence. Harvey would be one of his College tutors and a brilliant young man of 22; Leycester House, from which the Immerito letters are dated, would be a house he would be likely, after Sir Nicholas Bacon's death, to live at when not at the Court. In view of the cipher story it is interesting to read Ascham's statement about the Queen's literary ability. "Yes, I believe that beside her perfect readiness in Latin, Italian, French, and Spanish, she readeth here now at Windsor (1571) more Greek every day than some Prebendary of this Church doth read Latin in a whole week."

On Mr. Collins' assumption, the man who, before the age of twenty-one, developed such wonderful classical facility in a one-horse school, next proceeds to desert his wife and children at Stratford, passing on the way the neighbouring University Town of Oxford, in order to become an actor of small parts in London.

I leave out the horse-holding tradition because I want to keep to ascertained facts. Mr. Collins' imagination has given to "airy nothing, a local habitation." In one of the Plays are these lines:—

"Some are born great, some achieve greatness,
Some have greatness thrust upon them."

Shakspere was an actor, a masquer; he filled the position of mask for certain of the writings of a great man. This was in the way of his trade, *and to that position he remained true to the last.* Neither by recorded word of mouth, nor the terms of his will, or of any other published document, nor by the facts of his life after leaving the stage, did he attempt to further mislead. Despite ample wealth, he left his daughter uneducated. He behaved as a retired actor, which he was, rather than as a retired author, which he was not. He was no fraud; he was a masque and merely played his part. *His greatness has been thrust upon him.*

PARKER WOODWARD.

A PLEASAUNT INVECTIVE AGAINST PLAIERS.*

IN his introduction to "The Poems of Shakespeare," Mr. George Wyndham pictures the youthful Shaksper leaving his native Stratford and plunging into the flood-tide of literary London. "*It is easy to conjecture the experiences of a youth and a poet translated*

* In the year 1579 a pamphlet was published with the following genial and comprehensive title:—The | Schoole of Abuse | containing a pleasaunt in | -vective against Poets, Pipers, | Plaiers, Jesters and such like | caterpillars of a commonwelth; | setting up the Flagge of Defiance to their | mischievous exercise and overthrow- | ing their Bulwarkes by Prophane | writers, Naturall reason, and | common experience. | A discourse as pleasaunt for | gentlemen that favour lear | -ning, as profitable for all that wyll | follow vertue. | By Stephen Gosson, Stud., Oxon.

from Warwickshire to a London rocking and roaring with Armada-patriotism and the literary fervour of the 'University pens.'"

Mr. Wyndham sees, in his mind's eye, the young provincial "*caught up in the two most intellectual movements of that day, the new English drama, and the reproduction in the original or in translation of classical masterpieces.*" He does not discountenance the tradition that Shaksper's first occupation in the "magical unknown" was some menial employment in the theatre yard.

The testimony of contemporary observers does not, however, support the traditional theory that the playhouses were fervid intellectual centres. On the contrary, in 1579 a Mr. Spark termed them "the nest of the devil and the sink of all sin."* Ben Jonson, in the dedication of *The Fox* (1607), remarks:—"Now, especially in dramatic, or, as they term it, stage poetry, nothing but ribaldry, profanation, blasphemy, all license of offence to God and man, is practised. . . . I have ever trembled to think towards the least prophaneness, have loathed the use of such foul and unwashed bawdry as is now made the food of the scene."

In 1572 Harrison, in his Chronology, wrote:—"Would to God these comon plaie(r)s were exiled for altogether as seminaries of impiety and their theatres pulled downe as no better than houses of bawdrie."†

The moral sentiment of Elizabethan London was never over-scrupulously nice, and the behaviour of the players must have been singularly scandalous to have led to such extreme measures as were adopted. Plays were banished and the Corporation forbad the erection of playhouses within the City precincts. For this reason "The Globe" at Blackfriars, "The Curtain" at Shore-

* Arber Reprint, No. 3, p. 10.

† "Elizabethan England," *Scott Library*, p. 268.

ditch, and the other playhouses were erected outside the boundaries, and within swift and convenient access to those amazing sanctuaries for malefactors known as Alsatia and The Clink.

Gabriel Harvey, the friend of Spenser, describes the theatre districts—Bankside, Shoreditch, and Southwark —as "filthie haunts,"* and in 1597 we have a luminous definition of theatres by the Lord Mayor of London as—"ordinary places for vagrant persons, maisterless men, thieves, horsestealers, whoremongers, cozeners, coney-catchers, contrivers of treason, and other idele and dangerous persons."†

It is evident that unimpassioned truth does not countenance any other inference than that the Elizabethan playhouse was a vortex of ignorance and bestiality. It could hardly be otherwise when we recognise that professional players were the dregs of the community. Under the Poor Law of 1572 they were, unless licensed, deemed to be "roges, vacabounds, and sturdye beggars." On first conviction they were ordered "to bee grevouslye whipped and burnte through the gristle of the right eare with an hot yron of the compasse of an ynch about, manifestinge his or her rogyshe kind of lyef."‡ A second offence was adjudged felony; a third entailed death. In order to evade the stringencies of the law, the unhappy actors—"foolish beasts," Nash terms them, "mocked and flouted at in every man's common talk"§—sheltered themselves by enrolment as the servants of some great man. There is a popular but erroneous tradition that aristocrat and actor fraternised together, but as Dyce asserts "plays were scarcely recognised as literature," and "authors seldom

* "Foure Letters," 1592.
† City of London MS. Outlines, p. 214.
‡ 14th Eliz., c. 5.
§ "Summer's Last Will" (Prologue).

presumed to approach the mansions of the aristocracy."* Even the revelling students at Grays Inn (after the Twelfth Night fiasco, in which it is not unlikely that Mr. Wm. Shaksper figured) protested against the insult of having had foisted upon them "a company of base and common fellows,"—to wit, professional players.

An excellent example of the Elizabethan actor-dramatist is Mr. Robert Greene. He is assumed to have collaborated with Shaksper, and is popularly supposed to have shared in the literary and philosophic feasts at the Mermaid Tavern. "Whoredome," says Greene, "was my daily exercise,† and gluttony with drunkenness was my onely delight," and, he adds, though "famoused for an arch-playmaking poet," his companions "were lightly the lewdest persons in the land, apt for pilfering, perjury, forgery, or any villainy, who came still to my lodgings, and these would continue quaffing, carousing, and surfeiting with me all day long."‡

Mr. Wyndham pictures London rocking and roaring with "literary fervour." It would be less picturesque, but probably more accurate, to describe Shaksper's surroundings as "unwashed bawdrie." We have it on record in 1579 that three out of every four patients admitted into St. Bartholomew's Hospital were suffering from a disease due to immorality. For this state of affairs the surgeon of St. Bartholomew's blames the great number of rogues and vagabonds and the numerous lewd alehouses, "which are the very nests and harbourers of such filthy creatures."§ The sanitary surroundings in the better class Elizabethan, arouse our astonishment. "Erasmus gives a curious account

* Works of Marlowe, p. 25.

† "The Repentance of Robert Greene."

‡ "Shakespeare and His Predecessors" (Boas), p. 36.

§ "Social England" (Traill), Vol. III., p. 770.

of English dirtyness. He ascribes the plague from which England was hardly ever free, and the sweating sickness, partly to the incommodious form and bad exposition of the houses, to the filthyness of the streets, and to the sluttishness within doors. 'The floors,' says he, 'are commonly of clay, strewed with rushes, under which lies unmolested an ancient collection of beer, grease, fragments, bones, spittle, excrement of dogs and cats, and everything that is nasty.'"* If such were the conditions of the upper and middle classes, the sanitary surroundings of the lower and lowest orders obviously defy description.

Probably the poor "harlotry player" (to quote Shakespeare) was not very much worse than his fellow-citizens. It must be borne in mind that, to all intents and purposes, religion was a dead-letter. "To modern eyes," Green writes, "the Church under Elizabeth would seem little better than a religious chaos." After ten years of her rule "the bulk of Englishmen were found to be utterly devoid of religion, and came to church 'as to a May game.'"†

"Many churches," says Goadby, "were closed, and there were hundreds of parishes without incumbents devoting the Sunday to sports and licentiousness. The windows of the sacred edifices were broken, the doors were unhinged, the walls in decay, the very roofs stripped of their lead. 'The Book of God,' says Stubbes, 'was rent, ragged and all betorn.' Aisles, naves, and chancels were used for stabling horses. Armed men met in the churchyard and wrangled or shot pigeons with hand-guns. Pedlars sold their wares in the church porches during service. Morrice dancers excited inattention and wantonness by their presence in costume, so as to be ready for the frolics which generally followed

*"Curiosities of Literature," D'Israeli, Vol. II., p. 38.

†"Hist. Eng. People," Vol. II., p. 308.

prayers. . . . The church ales, in which God's house was turned into a drinking shop for profit—the ale having been brewed by the churchwardens for sale —led to abominable orgies." *

It is needless to go into objectionable *minutial*. Characteristic instances of gross manners may be found in Arber's Reprints (No. 3, p. 9), Brand's "Antiquities under May-day Customs" (p. 118), and indeed wherever the enquirer takes the trouble to search.

In *Every Man Out of his Humour*, Ben Jonson throws a grim light upon the condition into which St. Paul's Cathedral had fallen. Scene 1 of Act III. is placed in the "Middle Aisle of St. Paul's," generally known as Paul's Walk.

Orange: "What, Signor Whiffe! what fortune has brought you into these west parts?"

Shift: "Troth, signor! nothing but your rheum. I have been taking an ounce of tobacco hard by here with a gentleman, and I am come *to spit private in Paul's*."

"To spit private in Paul's"! What manner of times were these when the interior of the Cathedral served for such uses? In a tract written by Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, it is stated: "No place hath been more abused than Paul's hath been. . . . The south alley was for usury and popery, the north for simony, and the horsefair in the midst for all kinds of bargains, meetings, brawlings, murders, conspiracies. The font for ordinary payments of money as well known to all men as the beggar knows his dish. . . . So that without and within, above the ground and under, over the roof and beneath, from the top of the steeple and spire down to the low floor, not one spot was free from wickedness." †

* "The England of Shakespeare" (Goadby), pp. 77 - 88.

† "Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth" (Aiken), p. 186.

It is unnecessary to amplify this picture. Probably it is beyond the power of modern imagination to conceive the degradation of Elizabethan London. "In the time of Shakespeare," says Dr. Johnson, "the English nation was yet struggling to emerge from barbarity. . . . Literature was yet confined to professed scholars, or to men and women of high rank. The public was gross and dark; and to be able to read and write was an accomplishment still valued for its rarity."*

If Mr. Wyndham were to look deeper into history, he would necessarily picture with his retrospective eye not the traditional London rocking and roaring with literary fervour, but a London turbulent with an evil-smelling † crowd of "rakehells," "bona-robas," "roaring boys," and "roaring girls," "coney-catchers," "cozeners," "Knights of the Grape," and innumerable unclassed varieties of mediæval barbarism.

HAROLD BAYLEY.

* "Lives of the Poets," p. 517 *(Chandos Classics)*.

† "Good soap was an almost impossible luxury, and clothes had to be washed with cowdung, hemlock, nettles and refuse soap, than which, in Harrison's opinion, 'there is none more unkindly savour.'"—"Social England" (Traill), Vol. III., p. 544.

SIDELIGHTS.

EXTRACT from *History of Civilization in England.* H. T. Buckle, Vol. I., pp. 269, 270. Richards, London, 1903 :—

"IT is difficult for an ordinary reader, living in the middle of the nineteenth century, to understand, that only three hundred years before he was born, the public mind was in the benighted state disclosed in the preceding chapter. It is still more difficult for him to understand that the darkness was shared not merely by men of an average education, but by men of considerable ability, men in every respect among the foremost of their age. A reader of this sort may satisfy himself that the evidence is indisputable; he may verify the statements I have brought forward, and admit that there is no possible doubt about them; but even then he will find it hard to conceive that there ever was a state of society in which such miserable absurdities were welcomed as sober and important truths, and were supposed to form an essential part of the general stock of European knowledge.

"But a more careful examination will do much to dissipate this natural astonishment. In point of fact, so far from wondering that such things were believed, the wonder would have been if they were rejected. For in those times, as in all others, everything was of a piece. Not only in historical literature, but in all kinds of literature, on every subject—in science, in religion, in legislation—the presiding principle was a blind and unhesitating credulity. The more the history of Europe anterior to the seventeenth century is studied, the more completely will this fact be verified. Now and then a great man arose, who had his doubts respecting the universal belief; who whispered a suspicion as to the existence of giants thirty feet high, of dragons with wings, and of armies flying through

the air; who thought that astrology might be a cheat, and necromancy a bubble; and who even went so far as to raise a question respecting the propriety of drowning every witch and burning every heretic. A few such men there undoubtedly were; but they were despised as mere theorists, idle visionaries, who, unacquainted with the practice of life, arrogantly opposed their own reason to the wisdom of their ancestors. In the state of society in which they were born, it was impossible that they should make any permanent impression. Indeed, they had enough to do to look to themselves, and provide for their own security; for, until the latter part of the sixteenth century, there was no country in which a man was not in great personal peril if he expressed open doubts respecting the belief of his contemporaries."

EXTRACT from Archbishop Tenison's "Remains now set forth by him under the title of BACONIANA," p. 5, London, 1679 :—

"I AFFIRM, with good assurance (for Truth is bold) that amongst those few, who, by the strength of their private Reason, have resisted popular Errors, and advanced real and useful Learning; there has not arisen a more Eminent Person, than the *Lord High Chancellor Bacon*. Such great Wits, are not the common Births of Time: And they, surely, intended to signifie so much who said of the Phœnix (though in Hyperbole as well as Metaphor) that Nature gives the World that *Individual Species*, but once in five hundred Years."

[EXTRACT from an anonymous English translation of Boerhaave's "Method of Studying Physic," p. 83 *et seq.* London, 1719.]

BY antiquity I mean till the sixteenth century, and this age excelled all the preceding, which is chiefly owing to the most illustrious Francis

Bacon, Lord of Verulam; for in reality before his time the learned world was wholly taken up with the trifles of the Peripatetick philosophy, and commentators of the schools who had by their quiddities rendered physicks merely logical.

At that time came up the chymists, who were the first authors of Experimental History, whose knowledge in relation to the causes of things the Lord of Verulam suspecting, before the end of that century rose up in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and this great man only certainly deserved this honour, that he alone made greater progress in physicks than all that ever went before him, or succeeded him. The best edition of his works is in folio, printed at Frankfort 1665, though his English epistles are not there.

His character was this: He had so sprightly a genius that he could not be deceived or imposed upon; for never man was endued with a genius so penetrating into physicks; he was of an unparalleled diligence and industry; for while he was Lord-keeper of the Seals and Chancellor of England (which offices he admirably well discharged), he wrote all his works, which are deservedly divided into two parts; the first considers morals or ethics, and the second is purely philosophical.

. . . . .

I can assure you that in no author you will find greater science, prudence, and candour than in him,

* *Hermann Boerhaave* (b. 1668, d. 1738), "one of the most celebrated phsicians of modern times. . . . The genius of Boerhaave raised the fame of the University of Leyden, especially as a school of medicine, so as to make it a resort of strangers from every part of Europe. . . The reputation of this eminent man was not confined to Europe. A Chinese mandarin wrote him a letter directed '*To the illustrious Boerhaave, Physician in Europe*,' and it reached him in due course." . . . (Encyclopædia Brittannica, Vol. IV.)

who far excelled all Europeans, and even the English themselves, and has all that is good of Descartes.

. . . . .

Next to the Lord of Verulam (and who trod close in his steps) succeeded the illustrious Boyle, likewise an Englishman, and as great a glory to England; what that lord began, this nobleman endeavoured to perfect. Consider the times, and read whatever authors you please before Bacon, and compare their writings with his, and you will find him to have carried away the prize from them all.

. . . . .

At the time Boyle began to publish his Book of Natural Philosophy (excited by the death of Bacon) was instituted the Royal Society of London composed of members from all parts of England; and this society was erected on purpose to search into the secrets of nature. Much about the same time the same work was instituted and carried on in Germany, France, and Italy; that is, there was to be taken into this society men of the greatest ingenuity and candour, who should treat of the affections and dispositions of things natural with the highest circumspection and caution, not speculatively by reasonings or argument, but by experiments.

. . . . .

At the same time the English by publishing several books, began to communicate to the world in a regular method all what they had discoursed of in their private conferences. Which being experiments made according to the Lord of Verulam's plan, you may easily guess what a prodigious work that was: for they were Wallis, Newton, and the greatest mathematicians, naturalists, physicians, and chymists, who collected these experiments which are contained in

the philosophical transactions, a work begun in the year 1665, and continued to the year 1708; and (what is much to be lamented) are now left off.—"A Method of Studying Physic," Boerhaave, London, 1719; p. 83, *et seq.*

[EXTRACT from the Third Essay in "Essays on Several Important Subjects in Philosophy and Religion," by Joseph Glanvill,* Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty [James I.], and Fellow of the R. [oyal] S. [ociety]. London, 1676.]

THE later ages have great advantages in respect of opportunities and helps for the spreading and communicating of knowledge, and thereby of improving and enlarging it. This I shall demonstrate in three great instances, viz., printing, the compass, and the institution of the Royal Society. In this excellent history [of the Royal Society in London, by Thomas Sprat, London, 1667], the inquisitive may find what were the reasons of forming such a combination as the Royal Society, what is the nature of that constitution, what are their designs, and what they have done. . . .

But that I may not wholly refer my reader, which may look like a put-off, I'le here offer something concerning this establishment, as it is an advantage for the communication and increase of science. I say, then, that it was observed by the excellent Lord Bacon, and some other ingenious moderns, that philosophy, which should be an instrument to work with, to find out those aids that Providence hath laid up in Nature to help us against the inconveniences of this state, and to make such application of things as may tend to universal benefit; I say, they took notice that instead of such a philosophy as this, that which has usurped the name,

* Joseph Glanvill. B., 1636; d., 1680.

and obtained in the schools, was but a combination of general theories and notions, that were concluded rashly without due information from particulars, and spun out into unprofitable niceties that tend to nothing but dispute and talk, and were never like to advance any works for the benefit and use of men.

This being consider'd, the deep and judicious Verulam made the complaint, represented the defect and unprofitableness of the notional way, proposed another to reform and inlarge knowledge by observation and experiment, to examine and record particulars, and so to rise by degrees of induction to general propositions, and from them to take direction for new inquiries and more discoveries, and other axioms; that our notions may have a foundation upon which a solid philosophy may be built, that they may be firm, tite, and close knit, and suited to the phænomena of things; so that Nature being known it may be master'd, managed, and used in the services of humane life.

This was a mighty design, groundedly laid, wisely exprest, and happily recommended by the glorious author, who began nobly and directed with an incomparable conduct of wit and judgment. But to the carrying of it on, it was necessary there should be many heads and many hands, and those formed into an assembly that might inter-communicate their tryals and observations, that might joyntly work and jointly consider, that so the improvable, and luciferous phænomena that lie scatter'd up and down in the vast campaign of Nature might be aggregated and brought into a common store. This the great man desired, and formed a SOCIETY of experimenters in a romantick model [!], but could do no more. His time was not ripe for such performances.

These things, therefore, were consider'd also by the later virtuosi, who several of them join'd together, and

set themselves on work upon this grand design; in which they have been so happy as to obtain the Royal countenance and establishment, to gather a great body of generous persons of all qualities and sorts of learning, to overcome the difficulties of the institution, and to make a very encouraging and hopeful progress in their pursuits. For the account of which particulars I refer to the History, and only take notice, how ignorantly those rash and inconsiderate people talk who speak of this assembly as if they were a company of men whose only aim is to set up some new theories and notions in philosophy; whereas, indeed, their first and chief imployment is carefully to seek, and faithfully to report how things are *de facto;* and they continually declare against the establishment of theories and speculative doctrines which they note as one of the most considerable miscarriages in the philosophy of the schools. And their business is not to dispute, but work. So that those others also that look on them as pursuing phansyful designs are as wide and unjust in their ill-contriv'd censure; since their aims are to free philosophy from the vain images and compositions of phansie by making it palpable and bringing it down to the plain objects of the senses. For those are the faculties they appeale to, and complain that knowledge hath too long hover'd in the clouds of imagination; so that methinks this ignorant reproach is, as if those that doted on the tales of the Fabulous Age should clamour against Plutarch and Tacitus as idle romancers. For the main intention of this society is to erect a well-grounded Natural History which takes off the heats of wanton phansie, hinders its extravagant excursions, and ties it down to sober realities.

But we frequently hear an insulting objection against this philosophical society in the question, "What have they done?"—to which I could answer, in short, more

than all the philosophers of the notional way since Aristotle opened his shop in Greece; which saying may, perhaps, look to some like a fond and bold sentence. But whoever compares the repository of this society with all the volumes of disputers, will find it neither immodest nor unjust. And their history hath given us instances sufficient of their experiments, observations, and instruments to justify a bolder affirmation. But I insist not on this. The thing I would have observ'd is, that those who make the captious question do not comprehend the vastness of the work of this assembly, or have some phantastical imagination of it. They consider not that the design is laid as low, as the profoundest depths of Nature, and reacheth as high as the uppermost story of the universe; that it extends to all the varieties of the great world, and aims at the benefit of universal mankind.

[EXTRACT (translated into English) from *Die Freimaurerei* (Leipzig, 1835, 2 vols. 8vo.), a German translation by R. S. Acerrellos (anagram of Carl Roessler), of a French work by Reghellini da Schio.]

BACON OF VERULAM approved of the system of the Cabala,* and upon his island of Bensalem† introduced cabalistic laws.—I., p. 279.

. . . . .

Geber, Raymond Lully, Albertus Magnus, Arnold of Villanova, Bacon, and all alchemical writers consider the Rose to be the symbol of secrecy.—II., p. 6.

. . . . .

The working Masons have since the earliest times been united with the scientific Masons in *one* fraternal

* The *Cabala*, formerly an important Society, originated among the Jews. Its Founder (?) Simon Ben Jochai, and his book, "Sochar." (?) The latter is full of allegories and metaphors,

Society. They had a *common* origin, their separation being due to the force of Time and the power of Civilisation, which more and more obtained strength and perfection. But it should be noted, notwithstanding, that already before this separation, the Society of working Masons had been always supervised and led by men of very high reputation.

A great number of learned men, and some men of high birth, sought admission into the fraternity. It is well known that both in Germany and France, several centuries ago, those who enjoyed citizenship, of whatsoever rank and station they might be, were obliged to join some guild or society, that is, some corporation of artists and artisans. Therefore, since the guild of the Masons was the most famous and respected, men of rank and learning, for whom it was an easy matter to obtain admission, flocked to it from all sides, and as these men were not artisans, they were distinguished from the latter by the name of *Free* Masons. This designation, entirely equivalent to the other name which they were given, of *Adopted Masons*, was applied, then, to those who were admitted into a Society of artists or artisans, without, however, really practising their art or craft.

This Society, then, which was in the beginning, by

but clearer than the Apocalypse. Both books have been useful to Masonry. The system of allegories which they used could not, Reason told them, be converted into an idol.—Note based on C. ROESSLER. "The Cabalists among the Jews are professed anagrammatists; the third part of their art, which they call *themuru*, (*i.e.*, changing) being nothing but the art of making anagrams, or finding hidden and mystical meanings in names, which they do by changing, transposing, and differently combining the letters of those names."

"Encyclo. Brittann.," 8th Ed., Vol. II. p. 745, Art. Anagram.

† c.f. *New Atlantis.*

studies and sciences, and for the preservation of these intimately connected with the clergy, separated from the clergy, as the latter was wholly corrupt. . . .

In the 14th and 15th centuries, the members of the fraternity endeavoured to erect a bulwark against the destructive flood of abuses of the Roman power. They conceived, therefore, a plan, according to which their Society should be reformed, and consist henceforth of learned men only. This new Society, formed out of the old elements, separated from the working Masons. Its aim was to counteract religious superstition and the abuses of absolute power.

The first reformers were: in Germany, Rosenkreuz, and afterwards Valentine Andreæ; in England, Ashmole, Bacon, and others. These were joined by all those who, in regard to faith, rejected the teachings of Rome. By such uniting was formed the Fraternity out of the ruins of the old Knights Templar and of the Crusaders of every tongue. From that time on, this Society has ever made it its duty to seek and advance the Beautiful, the True, and the Good.—II., pp. 188—190. (See also p. 192.)

The taste for occult sciences and for the theosophy of the Rosicrucians was kept alive by some German writings, which caused a great sensation, especially in England. To these belong the "Chemical Nights" of Rosenkreuz, and the "General Reformation of the Whole World" by Valentine Andreæ, to which we shall return in speaking of German Masonry.

Nicolai says, and adduces several proofs for it, that in the year 1622 a company of men existed in the Hague, who called themselves Rosicrucians, and busied themselves with alchemy. Its founder was Christian Rose, and its branches were so wide-spread, that meetings of them were held in Amsterdam, Nuremberg, Hamburg, Danzig, Erfurt, Mantua, Venice, and other places.

When they appeared in England, Robert Fludd wrote a treatise in defence of the Rosicrucian Brethren. Fludd was initiated, and had a large number of pupils. He applied the principles of the Gnostics to Physics, and by his system produced the great transformation which the sciences underwent in England.

Elias Ashmole, a famous antiquary, had himself admitted into the Masonic fraternity in 1646. At about the same time, several Englishmen of learning, who clearly saw the need of physical experiments, seized the favourable opportunity to found a Society, which was to keep in view especially the advancement of learning. After some festivity of astrologers, persons of great importance in those days, they founded a Rosicrucian Society, after the model of the association existing in the Hague. They agreed among themselves to write a little less obscurely than the German Rosicrucians, but nevertheless wished likewise to communicate their discoveries to the brethren only, for fear that those discoveries might bring persecutions upon them.

The members of this new association belonged all to the Freemason Fraternity of London. The most famous names among them were Elias Ashmole, William Lully, Wharton, Smitz [sic], Oughtred, Preston, Warren, Thomas Wharton, the Physician, George Wharton, and the reverend gentlemen, John Pearson and John Hewit.

Ashmole improved the ritual of the act of initiation of the Rosicrucians, which was modelled almost completely upon the ancient Egyptian and Greek mysteries, and which have been partly preserved in the act of initiation of the Freemasons. A great number of innovations, which were subsequently introduced, were one of the main causes of the secession of the English Masons, which lasted up to the year 1813.

Ashmole, in his "Memoirs," describes the ceremonies

of a Masonic initiation which took place on March 2, of the year 1682 ; a very clear proof that some writers are very much in error who assert that the institution is quite modern, and arose only in most recent times.

The great Bacon had written his "New Atlantis," of which the apparent aim was the building of the house of Solomon, which was to remain concealed from the Profane. The learned men, of whom the Society founded by Ashmole consisted, accepted this allegory of the house of Solomon and retained the marks or devices, emblems, and other allegories of the Masons. They founded seven grades in order to reach the chessboard, in commemoration of the seven days of the creation, and this may have given rise to the seven degrees, which had to be passed through in order to arrive at Gnosis, that is, at Revelation of their secrets, by means of the studies needed for the knowledge of the Great Architect of the World, of His works, of Himself, and of man's duties toward others.

To be sure, the Society was obliged to keep its discoveries very secret, for the whole world regarded experimenting, according to the teachings of Rome, as contrary and hostile to religion and government.

Now, although this separate association was a corporate part of the brotherhood of Working Masons, of the Free and Adopted Masons, yet it did its work only in its secret meetings or councils. The subjects of these works, however, were the ancient mysteries, a philosophical theosophy and the allegorical construction of the house of Solomon.

At that time the desire for self-instruction went hand in hand with the desire to become free from the dominion of the Roman clergy. . . . This desire led to the formation of a second Society, which likewise wished to busy itself with secret sciences, but at the same time wished to oppose the Rosicrucians and act upon the

principle that the discoveries brought to light by experiments and the teachings of the sciences should of necessity be published.

One of its members, the great Bacon, afterwards wrote in such a manner that everyone could understand. For although his writings are composed in a mystical style, they are, nevertheless, much more comprehensible than the books of Rosenkreuz and Valentine Andreæ. He associated with himself John Wallis, John Wilkins*, Goddard, Foster, Glisson and other learned men, who determined to follow out Bacon's ideas. These he had explained in the "Atlantis," and they concerned the study of nature in her mysterious Being and Works according to a philosophy based upon Reason.

In the "Atlantis," a work which has led to very useful results,† there were allusions to the Crusaders and to the chosen Christians of the first centuries, as well as to the Rosicrucians. Similar allusions occurred in many earlier works. On that imaginary island he who permits the travellers to tarry there, wears a white turban with a red cross over it. We remind the reader of this one allusion; there are, however, many others.

These two societies organised in London had, so to

* He was the principall reviver of experimental philosophy (*secundum mentem Domini Baconi*) at Oxford, where he had weekely an *experimental philosophicall clubbe*, which began 1649, and was the *incunabile* of the *Royal Society*. When he came to London they met at ye Bull-head taverne, in Cheapside—*e.g.*, 1658, 1659, and after till it grew too big for a clubbe, and so they came to Gresham College parlour.—"Aubrey's Lives," p. 583.

John Wilkins was Lord Bishop of Chester, and first Secretary of the Royal Society. He is the author of a number of scientific treatises, and of "The Secret and Swift Messenger," an interesting book on ciphers first published in London, 1641.—From "Dictionary of National Biography."

† Foundation of Learned Societies?

speak, *one* cradle; both worked in the sciences of experience, the one with the purpose of confiding its discovered results only to its disciples,—the other, on the contrary, of making them generally useful to the human race by publication. Both, consisting of prominent and learned men, worked for the same end, but according to two diametrically opposed principles: the one [Bacon's], exoterically; the other [Ashmole's], esoterically. The members of the latter, who were men of rank and were involved in the English Revolution, joined the party of the king, who succumbed; the defence of their cause brought heavy losses of property upon them, and they became suspected by the victorious party. So they were obliged in their assemblies to make use of the greatest caution. The Society founded by Ashmole, therefore, considered it necessary to narrow its council more and more, and it is apparently quite possible that under these conditions they adopted allegories which had reference to the Scotch, who had given the King and Country proofs of their loyalty. Degrees were, therefore, invented which preserved their memory. Notwithstanding, it is certain that the purpose of this Society always remained the building of the house of Solomon, a favourite allegory of the Masons, to whom it belonged.—II., pp. 199-203.

ANAGRAMS AND ACROSTICS.

"Notwithstanding the sour sort of critics, good anagrams yield a delightful comfort and pleasant motion in honest minds."—CAMDEN: "Remaines Concerning Britaine."

D'ISRAELI, in his *Curiosities of Literature*,* prints some very interesting evidence with regard to the whimsical and now-a-days discredited subject of anagrams. "Modern critics," says D'Israeli, "are apt to thunder their anathemas on innocent heads: little versed in the eras of our literature and the fashions of our wit, popular criticism must submit to be guided by the literary historian. Kippis condemns Sir Symonds D'Ewes for his admiration of two anagrams expressive of the feelings of the times. It required the valour of Falstaff to attack extinct anagrams; and our pretended English Bayle thought himself secure in pronouncing all anagrammatists to be wanting in judgment and taste: yet, if this mechanical critic did not know something of the state and nature of anagrams in Sir Symonds' day, he was more deficient in that curiosity of Literature which his work required, than plain, honest Sir Symonds in the taste and judgment of which he is so contemptuously deprived. The author, who thus decides on the tastes of another age by those of his own day, and whose knowledge of the national literature does not extend beyond his own century, is neither historian nor critic. The truth is that anagrams were then the fashionable amusements of the wittiest and the most learned."

D'Israeli then gives a number of examples of anagrams, and continues:—

"Even old Camden, who lived in the golden age of

4 * Vol. II., "Anagrams and Echo Verses."

anagrams, notices the *difficilia quae pulchra*, the charming difficulty, 'as a whetstone of patience to them that shall practise it. For some have been seen to bite their pen, scratch their heads, bend their brows, bite their lips, beat the board, tear their papers, when their names were fair for somewhat and caught nothing therein.' Such was the troubled happiness of an anagrammatist. 'Yet,' adds our venerable author, 'notwithstanding the sour sort of critics, good anagrams yield a delightful comfort and pleasant motion in honest minds.'"*

It is safest for the student, in view of the peculiar literary methods of the English Renaissance, to resort to original or early editions, as there is never any telling what and how much may not have been edited out of existence by the modern reviser, who works according to his light, and when he doesn't understand a text, sometimes "improves" (?) upon the author or his supposedly know-nothing printer by correcting, or by substituting what he (the Editor) likes.

The conscientious philosophical investigator, however, unbiassed by academic and popular traditions, not narrowed by excessive specialism, nor overawed by professed authority, who closely studies a wide range of those early editions, will find his researches richly rewarded by glimpses of some remarkable doings (behind the scenes) of the great actors of those days.

Examples there are many, but a few easy and simple ones must suffice here:

William Camden, 1551-1623, "Clarenceux, King of Armes, surnamed the Learned," Patron and Master of Ben Jonson, in the book "Remaines concerning Britaine," attributed to him by Ben Jonson in conversation with William Drummond of Hawthornden (but in

* "Curiosities of Literature," Vol. II., pp. 229-234.

which, according to James Spedding, Sir Francis Bacon also had a hand) placed at the end of the chapter entitled, "Impreses," the two paragraphs following :—

"Confident was he in the goodness of his cause ; and the Justice of our Land, who only pictured *Justitia* with her Ballance and Sword, and this being an Anagramme of his name, *Dum illa, euincam.*

"For whom also was devised by his learned friend, *Pallas* defensive shield with Gorgon's head thereon, in respect of his late Soveraignes most gracious patronage of him with this A—Anagrammaticall [*sic*] word, *Nil malum, cui Dea.*"*

The two Latin mottoes are perfect anagrams of 'VVilliam Camden,' and may well have been intended for a hint to the observant reader, since the first three editions of this work were printed without a name on the title-page, the dedicatory epistle being signed "M. N." How the learned Camden must have chuckled to himself!

Elias Ashmole, 1617-1692, Windsor Herald, Member of the Royal Society, and Founder of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, "the greatest virtuoso and curioso that was ever known or read of in England before his time" † shows similar familiarity with anagrams and some uses to which they could be put, in connection with a work that he did not care apparently to acknowledge before the whole world.

He [Ashmole] also formed the acquaintance of Master Backhouse, a venerable Rosicrucian, who called him son, and "opened himself freely touching the great secret" . . . . On 13th May, 1653, Backhouse "told me [Ashmole] in syllables the true matter of the philosopher's stone, which he bequeathed to me as a legacy."

Dict. Nat'l. Biogr. Art., *Elias Ashmole*, p. 173.

* From the 3rd Edition, 4to., 1623, p. 197.
† Quoted in "Dictionary of National Biography."

He published in 1652 a collection of alchemical treatises, entitled "Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum," the title-page stating that it is by "Elias Ashmole, *Qui est Mercuriophilus Anglicus.*" His remarks as editor are highly instructive. In the Notes, p. 451, he points out, for instance, a half-hidden pseudonymous couplet in Thomas Norton's "Ordinall." The first line of this couplet is composed of the first syllables of the Proem and of Chapters I.—VI. inclusive. The second line consists of the entire first line of Chapter VII., thus:

TO, MAIS NOR, TON OF BRISE, TO
A parfet Master ye maie him trowe.

Ashmole seems to have good reason to condemn emphatically any changing of an original text, for he says in connection with this subject (Notes, p. 439):

"But as in other *Artes* and *Sciences*, the fault is scarce pardonable, so chiefly in *Hermetique Learning*, where the injury may prove irreparable," and at the same time he quotes a few lines from the following suggestive passage on p. 11 of Norton's "Ordinall":

"Now Soveraigne *Lord God*, me guide and speede,
For to my Matters as now I will proceede,
Praying all men which this Boke shall finde,
With devoute Prayers to have my soule in minde;
And that noe man for better ne for worse,
Chaunge my writing for drede of *God's curse:*
For where quick sentence shall seame not to be
Ther may wise men finde selcouthe previtye,
And chaunging of some one sillable
May make this Boke unprofitable.
Therefore trust not to one Reading or twaine,
But twenty tymes it would be over sayne;
For it conteyneth full ponderous sentence,
Albeit that it faute forme of Eloquence;
But the best thing that ye doe shall,
Is to reade many Bokes, and then this withall."

Now, there is a contemporary little alchemical treatise, entitled :

Fasciculus Chemicus, or Chymical Collections, expressing the Ingress, Progress, and Egress of the Secret Hermetic Science (etc.), whereunto is added the *Arcanum*, or Grand Secret of Hermetic Philosophy, both made English by

JAMES HASOLLE, ESQUIRE,

Qui est Mercuriophilus Anglicus (etc).

Who was James Hasolle, Esquire? The answer is almost too obvious to need demonstration. If Elias Ashmole (A) is *Mercuriophilus Anglicus* (B), and James Hasolle (C) is likewise *Mercuriophilus Anglicus* (B), then Elias Ashmole=James Hasolle. The two names constitute, indeed, a perfect anagram. It was found independently as here explained, but is already recorded in p. 562 of

"Auteurs déguisez sous des noms étrangers, Empruntez Supposez, Feints a plaisir, Chiffrez, Renversez, Retournez, ou changez d'une Langue en une autre."

A Paris chez ANTOINE DEZALLIER, etc., 1690.

(The "Avis au Lecteur" is signed A. BAILLET.)

as well as in E. Weller's *Lexicon Pseudonymorum*, Regensburg, 1886, p. 247.

The reader will be no longer surprised to learn that Ben Jonson, 1573 (?) 1637, rare wit and man of letters that he was, also knew all about Anagrams, Acrostics, and even Ciphers.

In the Folio Edition of his works, 1616-1641, vol. I, Epigrammes, there is on p. 779, Epigram XL., "On Margaret Ratcliffe." The initial letters of its 17 lines, read downwards, spell M.A.R.G.A.R.E.T R.A.T.C.L.I.F.F.E. The same kind of device spelling T.H.E A.L.C.H.E.M.I.S.T occurs in the prologue of *The Alchemist*, vol. I, p. 605 (1616.)

In Epigram XCII., "The New Crie," (that new crie being "Ripe statesmen, ripe") we read :

"They all get *Porta*, for the sundrie wayes
To write in cypher, and the severall keyes
To ope' the character."

The reference is to Giambattista della Porta's famous book on Ciphers(*), in which anagrams and acrostics are mentioned as kinds of ciphers.

A "Cambridge graduate," the author of "Is it Shakespeare?" has endeavoured to show that Jonson's Epigrams XXXVII. and LIIII. are aimed at Bacon. No. XXXVII. runs as follows:

"On Chev'rill, the Lawyer.

No cause, nor client fat, will Chev'rill leese,
But as they come, on both sides he takes fees,
And pleaseth both. For while he melts his greace
For this: that winnes, for whom he holds his peace."

The "Cambridge graduate" omits to point out that the initial letters of the four lines of this quatrain (reading upward) and of the first two words of the title are F.A.B.N.O.C., which, transposed, give F.B.A.C.O.N.

The Rev. Wm. A. Sutton, in his recently published *Shakespeare Enigma* observes that:—

"In the middle ages no new discovery was freely published. All the secrets, real or pretended, of the alchemists were concealed in obscure and enigmatic language; and to mention a well-known instance, the anagram in which Roger Bacon is supposed to have recorded his knowledge of the art of making gun-powder is so obscure, that its meaning is even now more or less doubtful.

The anagram in question is referred to in Henry B. Wheatley's little treatise "*Of Anagrams, etc.*," Hertford, 1862, pp. 71, 72.

(*) 1st Edition, *De furtivis literarum notis vulgo de ziferis, lib. IV.* Napoli, 1563, 4to.,—2nd Edition, *lib. V.*, Napoli, 1602, folio,—3rd Edition, entitled, *De occultis literarum notis, etc., lib. V.* Argentorati, 1606, 8vo.

"Anagrams have been sometimes made use of by authors to publish their discoveries to the world; and as an instance Roger Bacon has described the composition of gunpowder under the veil of an anagram in his work '*De Secretis Operibus Artis et Naturæ*, cap. II, thus :—

SALIS PETRAE *LURU VOPO VIR CAN UTRIET* SULPHURIS.

The five italicised words which are senseless mock-Latin may be resolved in the following way (the two U's being placed horizontally, one above the other, against the letter I being equivalent to B; and the U, of course, being equivalent to V) LURU VOPO VIR CAN VTRIET = PVLVER CARBON TRITV (O).

We have, therefore, a Triturate (intimate mixture) of Saltpetre, powdered Charcoal and Sulphur; and that is nothing else but gunpowder, the wonderful properties of which Roger Bacon accurately describes. Two forms of anagram appear to have been used to conceal this discovery. The version given by the Encyclopædia Britt. (8th Ed., Art. Gunpowder) is as follows :—

"Bacon, who was apparently afraid of revealing too much, conceals one of the ingredients under the veil of an anagram. He writes: 'Sed tamen salis petræ *luru mone cap ubre*, et sulphuris, et sic facies tonitrum et coruscationem, siscias artificium.' The italics are unmeaning in their present form, but the letters may be so combined as to make *carbonum pulvere*, or powdered charcoal. The passage may then be translated thus :— 'But nevertheless, take of saltpetre, with pounded charcoal and sulphur, and thus you will make thunder and lightning, if you know the mode of preparing them.' "

In a note appended to his pamphlet entitled "Are the Shakespeare Plays signed by Francis Bacon?" Dr. Isaac Hull Platt says :—

"I had supposed that the custom of introducing anagrams into works published in the 17th century by their authors for the

purpose of proving property afterwards, was so well known as not to require notice. In this I find I was mistaken."

"Thus Galileo announced his discovery that Venus had phases like the moon. He published a pamphlet containing the sentence: '*Hæc immatura a me jam frustra leguntur-oy*, which is an anagram of '*Cynthiæ figuras æmulatur Mater Amorum*,' the object apparently being to protect his claim to priority during the period in which he should be making further observations, and before he was ready to make the full announcement.

"This also illustrates the awkward circumlocutions authors were driven to by the exigencies of the anagram. Galileo is obliged to designate Venus as 'The Mother of the Loves,' and the moon by a Greek name, and then he has two letters left over—oy, about equivalent to 'hello'" (p. 122).

The author of the *Shakespeare Enigma* constructs an ingenious anagram from the words "*Bome boon for boon prescian*" occurring in *Love's Labour's Lost.* 1623 folio, p. 136, Col. 1. By transposition of the letters of this sentence he makes them yield

"*Pro bono orbis F. Bacon e(st) nemo.*"

The letters s, t, are absent from the original text, where the Latin jargon is followed by the words "a little scratcht, 'twil serve." He comments upon this obscure passage thus:

"In old Latin books *e* with a scratch or stroke over it, thus *é*, stands for *est*. May it not be that the words 'a little scratched, 'twill serve,' mean that the anagram will do for the purpose intended with the aid of a slight stroke or scratch of the pen over the second *e*" (p. 6).

D'Israeli, in "Curiosities of Literature," instances the case of:—

Francis Colonna, an Italian Monk, the author of a singular book entitled "The Dream of Poliphilus," in which he relates his amours with a lady of the name of Polia. It was considered improper to prefix his name to the work; but being desirous of marking it by some peculiarity that he might claim it at any

distant day, he contrived that the initial letters of every chapter should be formed of those of his name, and of the subject he treats. This strange invention was not discovered till many years afterwards: when the wits employed themselves in deciphering it, unfortunately it became a source of literary altercation, being susceptible of various readings. (Vol. I. p. 300).

Mr. Porterfield Rynd draws our attention to the fact that in 1594, when reasons for concealment of *poetic* authorship were less cogent than those that soon afterwards led to the fabrication of alien authorship of *dramatic* writings, there appeared in quarto:—

"Lucrece. London. Printed by Richard Field for John Harrison, and are to be sold at the signe of the White Grey-hound in Paules Church-yard. 1594."

The opening stanza reads as follows:—

> FRom the besieged Ardea all in post,
> Borne by the trustlesse wings of false desire,
> Lust-breathed Tarquin, leaves the Roman host,
> And to Colatium beares the lightlesse fire,
> Which in pale embers hid, lurkes to aspire,
> And girdle with embraoing flames, the wast
> Of Colatine's fair love, Lucrece the chast.

The author's dedication (bearing the name William Shakespeare) commenced with a play upon "beginning" and "end"; or Alpha and Omega. At that time Francis Bacon, whose short signature was usually made "FRA.B." or "FR.B.," personified *LAW*, his chosen profession.

It is a curious fact that the first stanza of *Lucrece* contains the ACROSTIC:—FRA.B.LAW.A.O. In other words, the 1st stanza (of a poem, 265 stanzas long) is so designed that the initial and two other capital letters of the 1st line spell "FRA," and the initials of the next six lines in succession give:—"B.LAW.A.O."—of course "A.O." being plainly equivalent to the Alpha and Omega, or "Beginning" and "END," played upon in the dedication.

In the whole 264 stanzas which follow there is not another acrostic.

Does not this design, Mr. Rynd asks, amount to a concealed declaration that although for intelligible reasons Francis Bacon did not wish or dare to be identified openly as the author of the poem "*Lucrece*," yet in the skilfully devised acrostic "FRA.B.LAW. A.O." he rendered future identification possible?

GEORGE WHISTLER.

SHAKESPEARE, BACON, AND HOLINSHED.

ONE of the most inexplicable problems of the present time defying solution is the apathy and unwillingness to face the relation of Bacon to Shakespeare. That both use the same expressions in hundreds of instances, teach the same lessons, reproduce and paraphrase the same authors, make the same errors, even in quoting an author, is readily acknowledged; yet, when a dozen men from different standpoints express their deep conviction, that one name is but the cover for the other; that the reforming poet-philosopher sought in a cramped and intolerant age to teach men under the mask of fools, clowns, and jesters, gracious lessons of mercy and charity, the simple enunciation of such a theory is enough to place it out of court as fantastic and absurd. The Word of God may be challenged from cover to cover, its inspiration denied, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch doubted; critics may trace two writers in Isaiah, and assert the post-exilian date of Daniel; the latest Gospel may have its authenticity denied to the critics' own satisfaction, and their numerous

followers. But no sacrilegious hand may lay its fingers on Shakespeare, or suggest that he was but a mask for the master-mind of the new birth of learning.

Many have called attention to the fact that the writer of the plays drew largely from earlier originals, and that a large part of the historical plays is taken from the Chronicles of Holinshed—here paraphrased, there the exact language used! The speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury in *Henry V.* we select as fairly typical, and place a few lines side by side for comparison :—

Henry V.—Act I., Sc. I.

"In terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant."
"No woman shall succeed in Salique land :"
Which Salique land the French unjustly gloze
To be the realm of France, and Pharamond
The founder of this law and female bar,
Yet their own authors faithfully affirm
That the land Salike is in Germany,
Between the floods of Sala and of Elbe.

Holinshed, page 545.

"In terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant," that is to saie, "Into the Salike land let not woman succeed." Which the French glossers expound to be the realme of France, and that this law was made by King Pharamond ; whereas yet their own authors affirme that the land Salike is in Germanie, between the rivers of Elbe and Sala.

To save space we have only given the first few lines of Canterbury's speech, as an average sample of the entire fifty lines. The King asks, "May I with right and conscience make this claim?" The Archbishop replies with eighteen lines more. Of these we instance the first four :—

Henry V—Act I., Sc. I.

The sin upon my head dread sovereign
For in the book of Numbers it is writ—
When the son dies, let the inheritance
Descend unto the daughter.

Holinshed's Chronicles,—*Henry V.*, page 546.

The Archbishop further alleged out of the book of Numbers this saieng : When a man dieth without a son, let the inheritance descend to his daughter.

Ibid.

If we may pass, we will; if we be hindered
We shall your tawny ground with your red blood
Discolor.

Ibid.

And yet wish I not anie of you to be so unadvised as to be the occasion that I dye your tawny ground with your red blood.

This gives a passable idea how the writer of the plays essentially reproduces and paraphrases the narrative of the old Chronicler, and weaves it into his own work. It occurred to us it would give additional force to this theory if it could be shown that Bacon did the same thing in his acknowledged works. If indeed Bacon were the real author of the plays, it was quite possible he might use Holinshed, and actually (as seemed to be habitual with him) paraphrase the old Chronicler in his important work, *Henry VII.* After a patient search through the black letter edition of 1587, we found our conjectures fully confirmed, for Bacon reproduces and paraphrases the narrative of Holinshed as freely in his history as he does in the plays. We give several examples:—

Francis Bacon's *Henry VII.*

"And thereupon he took a fit occasion to send to the Lord Treasurer and Master Bray, whom he used as counsellor, to the Lord Mayor of London, requiring of the city a prest of six thousand marks; but after parleys, he could obtain but two thousand pounds."

Holinshed, page 764.

"Sent the Lord Treasurer with Maister Reginald Braie and others unto the Lord Mayor of London, requiring a prest of six thousand marks. Whereupon the said Lord Mayor and his brethren, with the Commons of the Citie, granted a prest of two thousand pounds."

Ibid.

"The Staffords likewise, and their forces, hearing what had happened to the Lord Lovel, in whose success their chief trust was, despaired and dispersed. The two brothers taking sanctuary at Colnham, a village near Abingdon, which place upon view of their privilege in the King's Bench being judged

Ibid.

"Sir Humphrey Stafford also, hearing what had happened to the Lord Lovel, in great displeasure and sorrowe, and for feare left his enterprise, and in like manner fled and tooke sanctuarie at Colnham, a village not past two miles from Abingdon. But because that sanctuarie was not sufficient

no sufficient sanctuary for traitors, Humphrey was executed at Tyburne, and Thomas, as being led by his elder brother, was pardoned."

defense (as was proved before the justices of the King's Bench) for traitors, he was taken from that place and brought to execution at Tiborne, but his brother Thomas, that was with him, was pardoned."

Ibid.

"There died upon the place all the chieftans, that is the Earl of Lincoln, the Earl of Kildare, Francis Lord Lovel, Martin Swart, and Sir Thomas Broughton, all making good the fight without any ground given. Only of the Lord Lovel there went a report, that he fled, and swam over Trent on horse back, but could not recover the further side by reason of the steepness of the bank, and was drowned in the river."

Holinshed, page 767.

"For there the cheefe capteins, the Earl of Lincolne, and the Lord Lovel, Sir Thomas Broughton, Martin Sward, and the Lord Gerardine, capteine of the Irish men, were slaine and found dead in the verie places they had chosen alive to fight in not giving one foot of ground to their adversaries.

"Howbeit some affirme that the Lord Lovel tooke his horse and would have fled over Trent, but was not able to recover the further side for the highness of the banke, and so was drowned in the river."

"The Duke of Saxony having won the town of Dam, sent immediately to the King to let him know it was Sluice chiefly, and the Lord Ravenstein that kept the rebellion of Flanders in life, and that if it pleased the King to besiege it by sea, he also would besiege it by land."

"The Duke of Saxonie having wonne the town of Dam sent to the King of England, that if it would please him to minister anie aid by sea he would besiege Sluis by land."

We would call attention to the fact that Bacon largely sets his finest work in contradistinction to the work he uses of older authors. If we take *Henry VIII.* as an example, we find that Buckingham's dying speech is not found in Holinshed, nor Cromwell's conversations with Wolsey, nor Wolsey's speech. The scene in which Cranmer is made to wait with lackeys in the antechamber is not in Holinshed, and in fact, as Courtenay has pointed out, the actual occurrence of the incident did not take place until years after, when Catherine Parr was Queen. We hold that Bacon used

the occurrence even to misplacing it, in order to reproduce the outrageous treatment that he himself received at the hands of Buckingham. In fact, to understand and appreciate the plays it is needful to have an idea of the original groundwork of each play, to see the additions he makes to the *personel;* to realise where *his own work absolutely* is dovetailed in; and though he often recasts the borrowed work and presents it to us in a beautified form, yet it is in no way comparable to the creations of his own mind. To those whose eyes are open to discern it, it is indeed a charming study, and full of veiled teaching, as indicated in the preface to the "Wisdom of the Ancients" by allegory, metaphor, and allusion.

The instances we have quoted are typical of scores and hundreds; they occur in the majority of instances when no principle is involved, and no Baconian teaching is required; in other words, when it is the bare relation of some historical event (and then it is as if the lion slept), his own peculiar genius is not needed. But right in the middle sometimes of a mere reproduction or paraphrase of one of the old Chroniclers, North's translation of Plutarch, or perhaps a Latin poet; all at once his slumbering genius awakes to the exercise of its mighty power, and, like Samson snapping the green wyths, he is himself again.

GEORGE JAMES.

"THE 'BACONIAN MINT': ITS CLAIMS EXAMINED BY W. WILLIS."

THIS plausible brochure was compiled by Judge Willis, for the purpose, amongst others, of inducing the author of "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light" to cancel Chapter XIV. of that work (p. 98), on the ground that none of the words therein credited to Bacon, as additions to the English language, were either the words of Bacon, or used for the first time in the plays. Judge Willis thus formulates his creed on this point: "As the result of my examination, I firmly believe that Lord Bacon did not enrich the English language by the addition of a single new word, nor by the use of a word in a new or unusual sense" (p. 3).

To this, I would say that Judge Willis, while in some cases successful in detecting trivial errors, entirely fails to prove his sweeping assertion above quoted, as of the 230 words comprised in Chapter XIV. no less than 80 or thereabouts remain unaffected in the slightest degree by his criticism. As regards the remaining 150 words, which directly or by implication Judge Willis asserts that Mr. Theobald regards as originating with Bacon, though Judge Willis is very clear on this point, with respect to his meaning, yet he nowhere specifies in what chapter and in what terms this statement is made. Certainly I can find no such assertion in Chapter XIV. or anywhere else in the book, and Judge Willis must be held to fail in his general argument, from directing it against a proposition which Mr. Theobald has nowhere put forward.

In many instances it is true that Mr. Theobald directs attention to the fact, that the same words either having the same sense or maybe an entirely

different one, occur in the works of Bacon; but this is very far from what Judge Willis charges him with, that is, claiming that all these words, 230 in number, originated with Bacon. There is another very important error made by Judge Willis, an error as little countenanced by facts as it is permissible in common honesty. To bear out this assertion, I would here demur to one "method" of proof adopted by Judge Willis to support his argument, though I emphatically exonerate him from any suspicion in his own mind of the essentially unfair character of that part of his "method"; I allude to the following passage:—

"The reader should bear in mind the following dates; The birth of Lord Bacon, 1561; of Shakespeare, 1564; the publication of the 'Folio Volume of Shakespeare, 1623'" (p. 4).

Of course it is obvious that any word used prior to 1561 could not have been introduced into English by Bacon; or any word prior to 1564 by Shakespeare; but the same suggestion made with regard to the plays (taking 1623, the date of the First Folio), as the critical date wherefrom to calculate, is unfair, not to say absurd. Take, for example, the word "constringed"—

> "The dreadful spout,
> Which shipmen do the hurricano call,
> *Constringed* in mass by the Almighty sun.
> *Troilus and Cressida*, V., 2, 173.

Of this play, Mr. Furnival says in his preface to the "Leopold" Shakespeare (p. 80): "We only *know* that it was published in 1609." Yet, Judge Willis quotes, as an earlier authority for this word, *Burton's Anatomy*, 1621 (p. 25), and so on in other cases as well. This won't do; and it is surprising that the gross unfairness of such an argument never struck him, as I am confident it never did, or he would not have used it. In the

place, therefore, of this untenable *Hijra* of 1623 I will assume as approximately correct (following in this the "Leopold" Shakespeare) the earliest dates accepted by Professor Delius of the plays as below:—*All's Well*, 1601; *As You Like It*, 1600; *Comedy of Errors*, 1589; *Coriolanus*, 1607; *Cymbeline*, 1610; *Julius Cæsar*, 1601; *King Henry VI.* (1, 2, 3), 1592; *King Henry VIII.*, 1623; *King John*, 1595; *Macbeth*, 1605; *Measure for Measure*, 1603; *The Taming of the Shrew*, 1596; *The Tempest*, 1610; *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 1590; *Twelfth Night*, 1601.

In one of his opening statements (p. 1), Judge Willis makes a serious mistake (if my view is correct) in confounding cause with effect, where he thus expresses himself: "Mr. Theobald says that such words could not be coined by the man who was educated at the Grammar School of Stratford-upon-Avon; that the man who coined these words was none other than Lord Bacon. For this purpose, Mr. Theobald *assumes* a 'Baconian Mint,' in violation of Lord Bacon's teaching, not to take words for things." Now, all this is mere sophistry; the author of "Shakespeare Studies" did not *assume* the existence of any "Baconian Mint," as a basis of proof, but arrived rather at the conclusion that such a "Mint" existed (figuratively speaking) as a necessary deduction from the facts marshalled by him throughout his book to that end. This may seem a trivial criticism of mine, but on a subject like that in question, lax statements are much to be deprecated. Again, Judge Willis says, "Where two men are born about the same time" (p. 2), and so forth, all the while ignoring here, and elsewhere, the difference which inevitably subsists between the "Clown" and the "Courtier," which can neither be evaded nor ignored in the discussion in question, much as those who agree with Judge Willis may wish to do so.

Baconians consistently refuse to acknowledge the existence of an intellectual monster like Frankenstein's creation, as presented to us by such writers as Miss Marriott, Mrs. Stopes, Mr. Sidney Lee, and their predecessors in imaginative biography.

Does Judge Willis, too, seriously wish us to think that Mr. Theobald maintains in Chapter XIV. or anywhere else that "Naso," "Stuprum," and "Cacodaemon" are words invented by the author of the plays, and if so, why does he not quote the passage in the book, whereon he bases so ridiculous a supposition?

"Naso" is lugged in for the sake of a "pun;" "Stuprum" is Ovidian (Ars Amat. I. 104); and "Cacodaemon" is used by Buchanan (Franciscanus, line 640), with whose writings there is reason to think the author of the plays was acquainted.

Where Judge Willis says, "The Latin word *contriverunt*, found in Bacon, was in use before he wrote a line" (p. 27), does he mean to infer that Mr. Theobald was unprepared to admit as much, else why insist on so obvious a truism?

When commenting on the word "fact," Judge Willis entirely fails to apprehend Mr. Theobald's argument, which was that throughout the plays the word "fact" is never used save in a bad sense (a crime), in which sense it is similarly used by Bacon; and Judge Willis wastes therefore more than a page to prove what Mr. Theobald nowhere questions, namely, that the word "fact" was used in its modern sense long before Bacon was born (pp. 46, 47). The argument of Bacon's using a word in the only sense it is used in the plays may not be very strong, but that does not justify Judge Willis in misrepresenting it.

Judge Willis must indeed be hard driven to find an earlier use of the word "imponed," if he can find no more likely source than State Papers of 1564 (p. 52),

for Shakespeare to come across the word in. We are familiar with the intellectual symposia Shakespeare is supposed to have joined in at the "Mermaid," but "Shakespeare," wading through State documents to gather up the facts and language reproduced in the plays, is a picture the matter-of-fact brain refuses to consider seriously. Judge Willis, however, is possessed with no such scruples, as under the word "indubitate" he quotes the chronicles of Caxton (1480), Fabyan (1490) and Hall as the possible source whence Shakespeare derived the word. Oddly enough Bacon is the only other user of the term, quoted by either Theobald or Judge Willis, and Shakespeare could not have borrowed the word from Bacon ("Life of Henry VII.," 1623), when the play in which it occurs was published in 1588! Curious all this; very! But, *what* I would ask, is not curious that helps to sustain the Shakespeare myth!

At page 99 Judge Willis says, "I feel certain that Shakespeare became furnished with words by his acquaintance with the Latin language, by his knowledge of the rich and varied literature existing in his native tongue, and by intercourse with the cultured men of his age." Judge Willis supports, too, the ability of the Stratford Grammar School (which Shakspere may have attended for a short time) to impart a classical education, by citing the names of many illustrious men who went straight from their grammar schools to Oxford and Cambridge. But there is no parallel between these cases, for during the period in the lives of the above men when they were completing their education at one of the universities, Mr. Wm. Shaksper was helping as slaughter-man (according to some) or jobbing in a sordid and menial capacity in London, so far as we can judge from the slender records preserved for us.

In conclusion, I deem it but right to give a complete list of the 230 words contained in Chapter XIV. of Mr. Theobald's work, that any reader may see at a glance the points at issue.

In the case of eight words Judge Willis gives references later than the date of the plays wherein they occur: Constringed, 1606 (Burton's "Anatomy," 1621); Convicted, 1595 (Potter, 1617; "Pilgrim Princes," 1607). Illustrate, 1588 (King, 1594). Immanity, 1588 (Arthur Dent, 1607). Plant, 1606 (Ben Jonson, (1610). Palliament, 1588 (Peele, 1594). Port (Magnificence), 1596 (Fairfax, 1600). Retentive, 1601 (Chapman, Odyssey, 1614).

In the case of the word, "retentive" the XIX. Odyssey of Chapman's translation is dated 1611, the plays wherein the word occurs being *Julius Cæsar* in 1601 and *Timon* 1607, not as Judge Willis makes out in 1623 (p. 87). The chief value in Judge Willis's compilation lies in the earlier dates he assigns to numbers of words current in Bacon's day. The idea, however, that by so doing he has refuted any assertion made by Mr. Theobald in Chapter XIV. is a delusion entirely due to a gratuitous error of his own.

The words which I maintain are essentially unaffected by the criticism of Judge Willis are: Abruption, Act, Antres, Cadent, Candidatus, Circummure, Confix, Congreeing, Consequence, Constringed, Convicted, Digested, Exorciser, Extravagancy, Factions, Festinate, Festinately, Fineless, Fortitude, Fracted, Generous, Illustrate, Imminence, Immure, Impertinency, Implorator, Incarnadine, Inclusive, Infestion, Influence, Ingenious, Insinuation, Insultment, Intenible, Intrinse, Maculate, Maculation, Mirable, Mure, Mural, Name, Naso, Obliged, Office, Oppugnancy, Ostentation, Partial, Party, Perigrinate, Pernicious, Persian, Plague (A net), Premised, Prevention, Proditor, Propend, Pro-

pugnation, Pudency, Questant, Questrists, Remotion, Retentive, Reverb, Roscius, Sacred, Salve, Sect, Sequent, Speculative, Stelled, Stuprum, Suppliance, Suspire, Suspiration, Umbrage, Uncivil, Unconfinable, Unsisting, Unseminared.

Without, however, going into further details, it is sufficient to say that Judge Willis's entire argument fails, from the fact that it is in no man's power to disprove an assertion which another man never made.

W. Theobald.

Ilfracombe, October, 1903.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

The Shakespeare Enigma.

UNDER the title of "The Shakespeare Enigma,"* the Rev. Wm. A. Sutton, S.J., has republished some of the excellent articles which have appeared from his pen in the *New Ireland Review*. Like most of those who investigate the subject, Father Sutton finds himself driven by the facts to declare himself a Baconian. He says truly:—"There can be no doubt of the ultimate result of the present controversy. When the triumph of truth in this matter will be generally acknowledged it is impossible to say. Recent events seem to point to a speedier victory than could be hoped for a few years ago. Distinguished scholars who have recently written on the question have forced the matter to the front, so that it is now a world-wide discussion; and it seems to be one which the world, in the long-run, will make up its mind to know the truth about."

* Sealy, Bryers & Walker. Dublin. Demy 8vo. 208 pp. 3/6.

"Rue Bacon, Paris."

THE question of street names has recently been exciting attention in Paris. A writer in the *Eclair* complains that a great number of streets are called after quite undistinguished persons, whose names jostle those of such men as Molière and Bonaparte. An instance is mentioned which is of interest to Baconians. There is a Rue Bacon. "You see in that," says the writer, "a tribute of homage paid to the Chancellor of England, the author of the works of Shakespeare. Yes, but in what a roundabout way. The owner of the property married a lady who was descended from that illustrious family."

A Critic Criticised.

THE January Number of *The Pall Mall Magazine* contains a scathing exposure of the crudities of Mr. Sidney Lee. It is from the pen of Mr. George Stronach, M.A.

The Elizabethan Literary Society.

FROM the syllabus for 1903-4 we note the following list of papers to be read at Toynbee Hall :—

Wednesday, January 6th, 1904 :—"Montaigne." By W. Francis Aitken. Wednesday, February 3rd:—"Golden Argosies." By O. Sallmann. Wednesday, March 2nd :—"Francis Bacon as a Man of Letters." By Sidney Lee. Wednesday, April 13th—"Elizabethan Minstrelsy." By F. Sidgwick. Wednesday, May 4th :—"Thomas Fuller." By A. H. Bullen.

On the other Wednesdays of the session the Society will meet at eight o'clock to read the plays of Ford and Wycherley in the Mermaid edition, and selected essays of Montaigne in Florio's translation.

Shaksper's Jug.

A RECENT number of *The Connoisseur* contained an illustration of "Shakespeare's Jug," which is in the Taunton Castle Museum. The jug is of stone-ware, and the cleaning of the top of the pewter lid has revealed the following inscription, slightly incised, "*Wm. Shakspere, 1602.*" "The scratching has been pronounced by experts to be genuine, and Sir Augustus Franks who examined it in 1895 gave his opinion that the inscription was coeval with the date of the jug."

Surely this relic should be enshrined at Stratford?

Wanted Facts.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

IN the January Number (1903) of BACONIANA is an article headed "Wanted Facts." At page 38 the writer, speaking of the collection of thirty-two Elegies on the death of Bacon made by G. Rawley, and published by George Cantor (Halle 1897), says, "As these remarkable Elegies have not received the attention that is due to them, we quote one or two of the more strikingly note-worthy passages addressed to the memory of "The man greater than all praise can reach—Francis Bacon." The writer speaks of "one or two," but the above quotation is the first of seventeen sentences from the Elegies in question. Moreover (as the writer asks for facts), I may say (1) That the quotations are not all from the Elegies themselves, so far as I can discover. (2) That the translations are in some cases wrong.* (3) That no references are given, so that the reader who wishes to compare the writer's translation with the original, has to waste some hours hunting through the twenty-three pages of Cantor's brochure to find out the particular passages selected for translation. Of the seventeen paragraphs within inverted commas, I have only been able to identify ten in the Elegies, and those all placed higgledy-piggledy; for example the first Elegy is reproduced by the writer in two quotations standing as 7 and 8, on page 38. Quotations 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 16 and 17 I have failed to identify in the Elegies. Quotation 4, contains a grave error, as it represents Bacon as restoring (by the *Novum Organum*) Comedy, in place of Philosophy (as it should be); and the quotation stops short, so as to exclude the

* [These translations were quoted from back Numbers of BACONIANA (Vols. IV., V. and VI.).—ED.]

allusion to the *Novum Organum;* or, in other words, the quotation is incorrect, in what it gives, and garbled, through what it omits. The quotations I have identified (the figures in brackets being the numbers of the Elegies) are, 4 (4, 20); 7 and 8 (1); 9 (29); 10 (30); 11 (32); 12 (24, line 5); 13 (5, line, 113); 14 (19); 15 (12, line 7).

The first Elegy by S. Collins is as follows :—

"Albani plorate Lares, tuque optime martyr,
Fata Verulamii non temeranda senis;
Optime martyr, et in veteres i tu quoque luctus,
Cui nil post dirum tristius Amphibalum."

The writer translates "*dirum Amphibalum*" by "that terrible ensnareing in the net." Now there is no net in question, nor any sense in the introduction of the word. There is moreover no such word for a net as Amphibalum. The writer was, I presume, misled by the first letter of the word not being a capital; but in Elegy IV., line 24, a similar mistake is made, "virbius" being printed for Virbius. The word "martyr" too occurs but once in the first couplet, and once again in the second, and in neither instance does the phrase apply to Bacon, as the writer would have us suppose! The martyr is, of course, St. Alban. The Elegy should be translated as below.

"O Lares, of St. Albans, and thou (its) most worthy martyr deplore the not to be lightly regarded death of the old man of Verulam. Plunge thou too, most worthy martyr, into long past sorrows, since to you nothing more sad has happened since the days of the fatal Amphibalus." (The cause of your own death).

Consult the life of St. Albans. "Book of Days," Vol I. p. 808. The first sentence on page 39 which I have been able to trace to the Elegies, is the fourth on the page, commencing from line 16 of the fourth Elegy in the 'Manes:'

"Talis plicata philologon ænigmatis,
Petiit Baconem vindicem, tali manu
Laetata cristas extulit Philosophia:
Humique soccis reptitantem comicis
Non proprio ardelionibus molimine
Sarcit, sed instauravit. Hinc politius;
Surgit cothurno celsiore et Organo,
Stagirita Virbius reviviscit novo."

Which the writer thus translates. (Omitting the last six words). "He (Bacon) humbly crept upon the ground (wearing) the flat foot sock of Comedy. With no meddling idle interference did he botch, but restored her (Comedy) completely afresh."

Here "Philosophy" is omitted, and Comedy (in brackets) quite unwarrantably substituted. I prefer to translate the passage as below.

"So when enveloped in the quibbles of philologists, did Philosophy joyfully raise her head, and make Bacon her champion, who humbly donning the comic sock, not only made

good (her defects), but by a method peculiarly his own completely renewed her. [Whence soaring more ornately on the loftier buskin, he reanimates the Stagirite (like) Virbius, by his *Novum Organum.*"] The writer omits the words here given in brackets.

Is it too much to ask the writer to give in some future communication the Latin originals of those passages which I have been unable to identify in Cantor's brochure? The grave defect of omitting references or authorities occurs throughout the paper.

At page 34 for example, the reader is referred to the journal of the "*Quatuor Coronati,*" without another word of explanation. Where is this work published or attainable? There are many similar instances, but I will conclude by reminding the writer and others whom it may concern that the *ipse dixit* of an anonymous writer is valueless.

W. THEOBALD.

Ilfracombe, October, 1903.

Shakespeare and Sanitation.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In a recent number of the *Spectator* I read, "Care for sanitation is one of the last teachings of wisdom that reach even the civilised who looked after drains in Elizabeth's reign, yet Shakespeare lived then, and Bacon too."

I can find no reference to "sanitation" in the works of Shakespeare, but the following facts on the subject may interest the readers both of the *Spectator* and of *Baconiana.*

Of Stratford in the days of Shakespeare Richard Grant White writes: "Stratford then contained about 1,800 inhabitants, who dwelt chiefly in thatched cottages, which straggled over the ground, &c. The streets were foul with offal, mud, muck heaps, and reeking stable refuse, the accumulation of which the town ordinances and the infliction of which fines could not prevent, even before the doors of the better sort of people." Halliwell-Phillips gives another snapshot of Stratford when he writes: "At this period, and for many generations afterwards, the sanitary condition of the thoroughfares of Stratford-on-Avon was simply terrible. Streamlets of a water power sufficient for the operation of corn mills meandered through the town. . . . . Here and there small middens were ever in the course of accumulation, the receptacles of offal and every species of nastiness. A regulation for the removal of these collections to certain specified localities interspersed throughout the borough, and known as common dung hills, appears to have been the extent of the interference that the authorities ventured or cared to exercise in such matters. Sometimes when the nuisance was thought to be sufficiently flagrant they made a raid on those inhabitants who had suffered their refuse to accumulate largely in the high-

ways. On one of these occasions, in April, 1552, John Shakspere was assessed in the sum of 12 pence for having amassed what was no doubt a conspicuous *sterquinarium* before his house in Hedley-street, and under these unsavoury circumstances does the history of the poet's father commence in the records of England" (I., 24).

No wonder, therefore, that we have no reference to "sanitation" in the plays of Shakespeare.

But what about Bacon? We know that he built for himself, according to his biographers, "a delightful and ingeniously constructed house at Gorhambury for recreation and study," with elaborate fish ponds attached. It is, of course, possible that Bacon in the construction of his mansion altogether neglected the subject of "sanitation." But it is scarcely probable in the light of his Essay "Of Building," where he says: "He that builds a fair house upon an ill seat committeth himself to prison, neither do I reckon it an ill seat only where the air is unwholesome." Bacon continues: "Neither is it ill-air only that maketh an ill seat, but . . . ill markets . . . want of water," &c. Then he recommends that "windows should be level with the floor, no whit sunk under ground, to avoid all dampishness," and so on. The last sentence of the Essay runs:—"As for offices, let them stand at distance, with some low galleries to pass from them to the palace itself."

To those who would build a house on "approved principles" I can give the advice—Turn to this Essay of Bacon's before commencing operations, and you will get more instruction on the subject of "sanitation" than you will obtain from some modern architects, or even from the plays of Shakespeare.

Your obedient servant,

GEORGE STRONACH.

Edinburgh, June 14th, 1903.

BURLEIGH'S ADVICE TO HIS SON.

THE venality at the Court of Elizabeth was so gross, that no public character appears even to have even professed a disdain of the influence of gifts and bribes; and we find Lord Burleigh inserting the following, among rules moral and prudential, drawn up for the use of his son Robert when young: "Be sure to keep some great man thy friend. But trouble him not for trifles. Compliment him often. Present him with many, yet small gifts, and of little charge. And if thou have cause to bestow any great gratuity let it be some such thing as may be daily in his sight. Otherwise, in this ambitious age, thou shalt remain as a hop without a pole; live in obscurity and be made a football for every insulting companion."—"Aikins' Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth," p. 478.

THE list of words referred to on p. 58 will be found in the next Number.—ED.